

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,724	1	1/14/2001	Ozan E. Erdogan	BEKAP005	2650
21912	7590	01/21/2005		. EXAMINER	
VAN PELT			MAI, TAN V		
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			2124	
				DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/003,724	ERDOGAN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	•	Tan V Mai	2124			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any earn	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period irre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		nely filed /s will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. ID (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
•	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 M					
2a) <u></u> ☐	<i>,</i> —	s action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1 abd 3-16</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/s	awn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers		•			
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•				
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)(Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in Application (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen		□ · · · · ·	(770, 140)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) X Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date 3/28/02.		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

•4

-14

The state of the s

• 9

THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAMED IN COLUMN TW

130

- 1. The drawings are objected to because Fig. 2 should be labeled "PRIOR ART". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim language is vague and indefinite. The phrase "multiple feedback filter that includes **two poles** and a **single op amp** is implement in the I and Q <u>channels</u>" (line 1-2) is indefinite. The "filter" should have TWO "single op amp" [each op amp for each channel]. The term "includes **two poles** and a single op amp" is misdescriptive because the "two poles" is NOT a physical structure. It seems to be a characteristic of the "single op amp". Also, the claim should be a <u>single sentence</u> format.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1 and 3-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moloudi et al.

1111

As per independent claim 1, Moloudi et al disclose, e.g., see Figs. 6 and 10, the invention substantially as claimed, including: a I channel and a Q channel. The input of each channel is coupled to the output of other channel. It is Moloudi et al do not specifically detail the claimed "passive networks"; however, the resisters (e.g., 86 & 88, 90 & 92) are capable of performing the equivalent function of "passive networks". It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the claimed invention according to Moloudi et al 's teachings because the device is a complex filter having feedback features as claimed.

As per claims 3-4, the claims add "low impedance output" features, the features are obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because each channel has op amp.

As per claims 5-8, Moloudi et al show the claimed invention.

As per independent claim 10, the examiner ONLY considers the first sentence of the claim. Moloudi et al's op amps have TWO RC networks for each op amp.

Therefore, each op amp should has TWO poles as claimed.

Due to the similarity of claims 11-12 and 14-15 claim 10, they are rejected under a similar rationale.

As per claims 9, 13 and 16, the claim add "complex filter is used for <u>image</u> rejection" features. The application is obvious design choice.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/003,724

Art Unit: 2124

5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the recorded references do NOT teach or suggest the novel "RC networks" features as recited in dependent claim 2.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan V. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3726. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Wed and Fri. from 9:30am to 2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is:

Official (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TAN V. MAI PRIMARY EXAMINER